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The most common response of faculty to the news that a colleague has moved up to an administrative post is that they must, until that very moment, have overestimated the person’s IQ!

Harold T. Shapiro (1935- ), President, University of Michigan; President, Princeton University

Standard 9b: EE1
A core faculty of sufficient size and expertise, committed to the fulfillment of the institutional mission, and responsible for the quality of its academic functions.

Definition of Shared Governance
- Governance = “where authority is located and how it is exercised” (Bowen & Tobin, p. 7)
- Robert Birnbaum: “the structures and processes through which institutional participants interact with and influence each other and communicate with the larger environment” (How Colleges Work, p. 4)
- “Shared governance” specifies the roles and responsibilities of the board of trustees, administrative leadership, and faculty.

Growth of Shared Governance
- In the earliest days of American higher education, the faculty had little if any influence on governance.
- The lack of mature, continuing faculty meant authority belonged to trustees and the president.
- Through the 1800s, the number of full-time permanent professors increased.
- Trustees delegated to the faculty responsibility of student discipline and instruction.
- Growth of research universities and land-grant universities led to faculty demands for greater consultation and the formal delegation of authority.
Since at least the interwar years, faculty in American universities have been entrusted with the responsibility, operating within budgetary constraints, for ensuring that curricular content is coherent and qualitatively sound. This is especially true when individual courses are being evaluated. As a matter of general principle, no one, we hope, would question the authority of faculty members to determine the intellectual content of courses for which they are responsible.

“Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” (1966)

- This statement was developed by the American Association of University Professors.
- The American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards commended it but did not endorse it.
- It established separate roles for board, administration, and faculty but encouraged mutual interaction and respect for one another’s interests.

To the faculty, the 1966 statement assigns the care of educational standards—including the admission of students, hiring and review of faculty, review and implementation of the curriculum, and participation in the immediate self-governance of departments and schools.

Shared Governance Today

- Every accrediting association reaffirms this role of the faculty.
- Their role includes developing student learning outcomes, designing curriculum to achieve the outcomes, and assessing how well the outcomes are achieved.
- “Faculty approval should be required, as is almost always the case today, when new programs of study are proposed or when major modifications are made in existing programs” (Bowen & Tobin, p. 167).

The faculty has primary responsibility for the academic program. This differentiates their work in and importance to shared governance and gives them significant and determining influence over the education program, the heart of the collegiate enterprise. It is what they primarily contribute to governance of the academy.

In most nonprofit colleges and universities, authority over academic affairs, including教授ial appointments, curriculum, criteria for admitting students, and research, rests largely in the hands of the faculty under some degree of oversight by the academic leadership—the president, the provost, and the deans.
Standard 9b: EE2

An academic structure organized in departments, divisions, or alternate approaches appropriate to the size and complexity of the institution and the level of education offered.

Clay Shirky, Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing without Organizations

- "As a group grows even to modest size, getting universal agreement becomes first difficult, then impossible" (p. 27).
- It becomes impossible for everyone to interact directly with everyone else.
- "For all of modern life, the basic solution has been to gather people together into organizations" (p. 29).

Robert Maynard Hutchins (1899-1977), President, University of Chicago

A university administrator has at least five constituents: the faculty, the trustees, the students, the alumni, and the public. He could profitably spend all his time with any one of the five. What he actually does, of course, is to spend just enough with each of the five to irritate the other four.

Ladder of Group Undertaking

- Rung 1: Sharing
  - Creates fewest demands on participants
- Rung 2: Cooperation
  - Involves changing your behavior to synchronize with people who are changing their behavior to synchronize with you
  - Creates group identity
- Rung 3: Collective Action
  - Decision of the group is binding on the individual members.

Clay Shirky, Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing without Organizations, p. 51

Information sharing produces shared awareness among the participants, and collaborative production relies on shared creation, but collective action creates shared responsibility, by tying the user’s identity to the identity of the group. In historical terms, a potluck dinner or a barn raising is collaborative production (the members work together to create something), while a union or a government engages in collective action, action that is undertaken in the name of the members meant to change something out in the world, often in opposition to other groups committed to different outcomes.
The “Tragedy of the Commons”

• Biologist Garrett Hardin: situations wherein individuals have an incentive to damage the collective good

• A group of shepherds who graze their sheep on a commonly owned pasture know that everyone benefits if everyone avoids overgrazing.

• Each shepherd has an incentive to allow his sheep to overgraze so that his actions ruin the pasture for everyone else.

• People are tempted to put self-interests before group well-being.

Managing Free Riders

• Free riders benefit from a resource while doing nothing in recompense.

• Societies deal with free riders in two ways:
  – 1. Eliminate the commons by splitting up the resources among the members who have an incentive to protect their own resources
  – 2. Governance = “mutual coercion, mutually agreed upon” (Hardin); prevents individuals from acting in their own interests rather than in the interests of the group

Henry P. Tappan (1805-1881), 1st President of the University of Michigan

How simple the idea of a university! An association of eminent scholars in every department of human knowledge; together with books embodying the results of human investigation and thinking, and all the means of advancing and illustrating knowledge. How simple the law which is to govern this association!—That each member as a thinker, investigator, and teacher shall be a law unto himself, in his own department.

Clay Shirky, Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing without Organizations, p. 53

Collective action involves challenges of governance or, put another way, rules for losing. In any group that is determined to take collective action, different members of the group will express different opinions. Whenever a decision is taken on behalf of the group, at least some members won’t get their way, and the bigger the group is, or the more decisions are made, the more often this will happen. For a group to take collective action, it must have some shared vision strong enough to bind the group together, despite periodic decisions that will inevitably displease at least some members.

Terms for Parts of Structure

Divisions
Departments
Schools
Faculty
Areas
Programs

The university is a collection of departments tied together by a common steam plant.
Options for Organization
- Graduate School?
- Adult Education?
- Online Education?
- Deans? Chairs? Directors?

Johnson's Academic Organization

The Silo Effect
- Minimal interaction with colleagues in other organizational or geographical areas
- Lack of “systems thinking” and “team learning” (learning organization characteristics)
- Failure to see the big picture
- Tendency to think locally rather than institutionally
- Territorial competition

Mary Burgan, What Ever Happened to the Faculty?, p. 113
The most self-interested level of academic governance is the department. Departments are by nature opportunistic, territorial, and sometimes provincial. They are frequently situated as rivals with one another for the resources that can help them thrive—faculty lines, clerical assistance, technology upgrades, and the like.

William G. Bowen & Eugene M. Tobin, Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education, p. 6
Even within the faculty ranks, cherished traditions of debate, consultation, deliberation, and the search for consensus have been diminished by the compartmentalized nature of the academy and by faculty members’ loyalties to their disciplines rather than to their institutions.
Breaking Down the Silos

- Practice transparency and openness among departments.
- Implement faculty learning communities
- Encourage collaborative teaching and interdisciplinary courses
- Randomly assign groups in faculty development meetings
- Report statistics by program rather than department

Standard 9b: EE3
A process of faculty appointment that involves related academic and administrative personnel.

Faculty Role in Appointments

- Bowen & Tobin suggest that "strong influence over, if not outright control of, decisions concerning faculty appointments and tenure" is "the most fundamental of faculty prerogatives" (p. 33).
- Hiring decisions can affect the future direction of an institution.

Full-Time Faculty Employment Procedures

- Deans inform Provost of faculty needs.
- Provost, in consultation with the President, approves a hire.
- Board of Trustees must approve a new faculty position.
- The dean appoints a search committee or includes the entire faculty in the search.

Full-Time Faculty Hiring Approvals

- Faculty of host school
- Dean of host school
- Vice Provost for Academic Services (approve qualifications)
- Provost
- President
- Board of Trustees (if creating a new position)
Part-Time Faculty Employment Procedures

- Deans submits CVs and transcripts to Vice Provost for Academic Services for approval of qualifications.
- Dean or program director interviews the candidate.
- Dean recommends a hire to Vice Provost for Academic Services, who recommends the hire to the Provost.

Standard 9b: EE4
A clear and publicized statement of faculty-adopted requirements for graduation that is consistently applied to the certification of graduates.

Faculty Role in Graduation Requirements

- By the early 1900s, it had become well established in American higher education that the faculty was primarily responsible for determining criteria to award degrees.
- Faculty determines courses and credit hours that must be completed for each program.
- Faculty also sets standards such as minimum GPA, residency requirements, and time limits for completing degrees.

Standard 9b: EE5
A faculty that is involved in academic-related decision-making processes especially related to admissions criteria, curriculum, and student development.

Participants in Academic Decision-Making

- Academic Council
- Provost (Chair)
- Vice Provost for Academic Services
- Associate Provost for Online Education
- Deans
- Registrar
- Director of Institutional Effectiveness
- Library Director
- Faculty Representatives
- Chief Admissions Officer
- Director of Financial Aid
- Chief Communications Officer
- Plenary Faculty

Academic Approval Processes

- Assessment Plans and Reports
- Curriculum
- Full-Time Faculty Hires
- New Courses
- New Programs
- Part-Time Faculty Hires
- Program Revisions
- School Dean Hires
- School-Specific Policies
- University-Wide Academic Policies
Simplistic as it may sound, we believe that shared governance should be viewed, not so much in terms of “who owns what,” but as embracing a commitment to a genuine sharing of perspectives—to the avoidance of constituency-based thinking (to the extent that this can be achieved in a world of real human beings!). What is most needed on the part of all parties, including both faculty and administrators, is not just a willingness to reject “we” versus “they” thinking, but an eagerness to embrace good ideas generated by others.